



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/598,889	06/21/2000	Christopher Kershaw	SCHW-800-(US)	6362

29585 7590 02/27/2004

GRAY CARY WARE & FREIDENRICH LLP
153 TOWNSEND
SUITE 800
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94107

EXAMINER

CHUONG, TRUC T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2174

10

DATE MAILED: 02/27/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/598,889

Applicant(s)

KERSHAW ET AL.

Examiner

Truc T Chuong

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 December 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is responsive to Amendment A, filed 12/03/03.
2. Claims 1-15 are pending in this application. In the Amendment A, claims 1, 7, 12 and 15 are independent claims, and claims 1, 2, 7, 10, 12, 13, and 15 are amended. This action is made final.
3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. Claim 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Leshem et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,870,559).

As to claim 1, Leshem teaches a method for comparing information from a plurality of items on a visual display (col. 2 lines 21-24; Map Comparison, col. 30 line 54-col. 31 line 26 and figs. 21-22), comprising the steps of

(a) identifying with a common tag (icons are used to represent the different URL types, col. 8 lines 14-26 and col. 9 lines 1-18), passages in the information for each of the plurality of items which relate to a category of information (parent-child node relationships, col. 2 lines 25-46);

(b) providing a different display area in the visual display for each of the plurality of items (col. 9 lines 19-37 and figs. 3-6, 14, and 23); and

Art Unit: 2174

(c) displaying in each of the display areas the passages from each of the plurality of items which are identified by a designated common tag (col. 9 lines 57-67, TABLE 1, col. 10 lines 1-15, col. 11 lines 8-65, and figs. 4-5, and 22).

As to claim 3, Leshem teaches the method of claim 1 wherein the information about the plurality of items is found in reports compiled for each of the plurality of items, and each of the common tags is an anchor link (col. 11 lines 8-65).

As to claim 4, Leshem teaches the method of claim 3 wherein the reports are compiled by an information server (Web site's server, col. 3 lines 7-29).

As to claim 5, Leshem teaches the method of claim 4 wherein the information server inserts the common tags into the reports (log file, col. 3 lines 7-29).

As to claim 6, Leshem teaches the method of claim 4 wherein the information server is located remotely from the visual display (computer network, col. 9 lines 1-18).

As to claim 7, Leshem teaches a method of providing comparative information in an image displayed by a visual display about a plurality of items, wherein information about the plurality of items includes portions relating to common topics, and further wherein the portions on common topics are identified in the information by identifying tags, the method comprising the steps of

(a) providing a navigational frame in the displayed image (figs. 4-5, infoseek web site of fig. 14, and image files, col. 8 lines 55-67);

(b) providing a plurality of dynamic frames in the displayed image (figs. 1-2, infoseek web site of fig. 14);

(c) receiving in the navigational frame a user designation of the items to be compared;

Art Unit: 2174

(d) display in each of the dynamic frames information about the items designated to be compared (col. 2 lines 21-24; Map Comparison, col. 30 line 54-col. 31 line 26 and figs. 21-22; Complete Path Display, col. 30 lines 34-41, and to compare two maps, col. 31 lines 3-26).

As to claim 8, Leshem teaches the method of claim 7 further including the steps of

(a) receiving in the navigational frame a user designation of an identifying tag;
(b) displaying in each of the dynamic frames the portion of the information on the designated items to be compared corresponding to the designated identifying tag.

As to claim 9, Leshem teaches the method of claim 7 further including the step of compiling the information about the plurality of items in a server located remotely from the visual display (Web site's server, col. 3 lines 7-29, and col. 32 lines 19-35).

As to claim 10, Leshem teaches the method of claim 9 further including the steps of

(a) sending a request to the server for reports about the items designated in the navigational frame (request to server, col. 9 lines 1-18);
(b) compiling in the sever the requested reports (process of sending request, col. 9 lines 1-18); and
(c) communicating the requested reports to the visual display (append the results to the map, col. 9 lines 45-55).

As to claim 11, Leshem teaches the method of claim 10 wherein the compiling step includes the step of assembling frames for the reports corresponding to each of the portions on the common topics (re-scanning process, col. 10 lines 54-67).

As to claims 12-14, they are apparatus claims of method claims 7-8, and 10. Note the rejections of claims 7-8, and 10 above respectively.

Art Unit: 2174

As to claim 15, it is individually similar in scope to claim 10 above; therefore, rejected under similar rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Freidman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,360,188 B1).

As to claim 2, Leshem teaches the method of claim 1 wherein the plurality of items are web pages, applications, documents, Java, video files, etc. (col. 8 lines 49-67) and the information being compared is information (Complete Path Display, col. 30 lines 34-41, and to compare two maps, col. 31 lines 3-26); however, Leshem does not clearly mention that the plurality items are investments. Freidman clearly teaches banking information and investments (col. 11 line 57-col. 12 line 63, and figs. 3-5, and 7C). It would have been obvious, at the time of the invention, a person with ordinary skill in the art would have the financial display features of Freidman's financial model into Leshem's management display to provide more flexible in accessing data for users throughout the Network because Leshem's environment uses the standard software such as: Microsoft Windows, Web Browser, CGI scripts, and other applications.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 12/03/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants argued the following:

Leshem appears to display information about the same item in different images.

The Examiner disagrees for the following reasons:

Leshem clearly teaches the Map Comparison Tool allows the user to visualize the changes of a portion of a tree structure or a particular entire site map of a Web site (col. 30 line 55-col. 31 line 26); therefore, Leshem's comparison tools can compare a smaller portion of the tree structure to a larger portion of the particular site referring to the displayed information of two different images in different windows.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Art Unit: 2174

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Truc T Chuong whose telephone number is 703-305-5753. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th and alternate Fridays 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine L. Kincaid can be reached on 703-308-0640. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Truc T. Chuong

02/17/04

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100